



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

heaven the next Saturday after I die," says she, "and what need I want of anything else?" says she. And old Peggy Donohue says, "sure it's confession," says she, "for when the priest says the Latin over me won't I be as clean of sin as the child unborn," says she, "and what more do I want than that," says she, "and what are yees all here for with your shillings, if that's not the thing?" says she. And then old Nancy Smith just riz on them all, "and sure," says she, "it's anancy yees are entirely; sure isn't one drop of the holy oil worth them all?" says she, "if I get one drop of that on me before the breath is out of me, what need I care for anything else?" says she. And now do you see, Jem, what none of them thought of to trust in?"

"Aye do I," said Jem. "Sure none of them knows that it's in their own Bible that the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin. And isn't it the poor thing that none of them thinks of trusting in that, the creatures? and isn't it the quare thing, if the re all Catholics, that they don't all trust in the same thing, but one taking one thing and another another thing? but sure that's the way with them. But, Pat, now did you tell them of the blood of Christ, and you at a station?"

"Well, deed then I did, Jem," says Pat. "Says I, girls, isn't the blood of Christ the best thing at all, for sure that cleanses from all sin?"

"And how did they take that at all, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "they just darned their eyes in me, as if they never heard the like of that before; but I hadn't time to hear more of it, for Pat Daly was just coming out of the room where Father John was hearing confessions, and he just got hearing what I said, so he turned round on me, and, 'Is it a Souper you are, to bring the like of that to a station with you?' says he. 'Not a bit of it,' says I; 'I takes no soup, thank God,' says I. And that's true, anyway, for not a drop of soup crossed my carcase since the Relief Committee gave it out in the famine. And I just turned round again on him, and, says I—'Are you going to tell us that the Soupers will have the blood of Christ all to themselves, and the Catholics get none of it?' says I; and with that he just quit it. Well, who do you think I seen go in next, Jem?"

"I don't know, Pat," said Jem.

"Well, if it wasn't Tim Tevlin," said Pat.

"Is it him," said Jem, "the poacher and sheep stealer, that never did an honest day's work in his life, and a Rib-bon-man into the bargain? What does the likes of him want of absolution?"

"Well, now," said Pat, "if Father John can wipe out a man's sins with a turn of his hand, isn't that just the man for him to try on?"

"Well, sure enough," said Jem; "but did he get absolution?"

"Well, I'll tell you about that," said Pat, "for the door stood open a minute, and I just seen it. There was the wee table, you know, with the plate on to drop the shilling in, just forenint the door, and Tim was giving it the go by. 'Where's the shilling?' says Father John. 'Hav'n't got it, your reverence,' says Tim. 'Go off with you and get it,' says Father John. 'And where will I get it, your reverence?' says Tim. 'What's that to me?' says Father John: 'off with you and get it.' And so Tim stood there quite easy. 'What are you waiting for there?' says Father John. 'Won't your reverence give me absolution?' says Tim. 'You'll get none without the shilling; be off out of that for it,' says Father John. So Tim stood there as easy as you please. 'What are you standing there for?' says Father John. 'Will I steal it, your reverence?' says Tim. 'Be off for the shilling, and don't bother me,' says Father John, with a screech. Well, Tim see'n Father John was minding nothing, he was that mad, and Tim had got just forenint the table, and as he was turning round, he just drops his hand in the plate, and lifts the shilling, and walks out, and away out of the house. And, a while after, in comes Tim; and, when the next man comes out, in goes Tim. 'And have you the shilling, now?' says Father John. 'Yes, your reverence,' says Tim, dropping the shilling in the plate; 'but sure I had to steal it, your reverence,' says he. Well, you never seen a man so deaf as Father John. He never heard a word, but just says—'Down on your knees,' says he. And then the door shut to, and I seen no more till Tim comes out, looking as pleased as if he had stole the best sheep in a flock."

"Well, now, I wonder," said Jem, "would the absolution do for stealing the shilling?"

"And why wouldn't it?" said Pat, "didn't he confess it, and get absolution?"

"Well, maybe it was as good for that as for all the rest," said Jem, "but did you go in yourself, Pat?"

"No, indeed, then, I didn't," said Pat, "but I was mighty feard Father John would have caught me, and lugged me in, maybe; for, a while after, out comes Father John in a hurry, and, 'Boys,' says he, 'is that Pat Doyle going down the street?' 'It is, your reverence,' says several. 'Out with you, boys, and fetch him in to me,' says Father John. So off the boys went. Well, you know, Jem, Pat Doyle is taken up with the readers, and has quit the Mass altogether, and goes to Church; so, in he comes with the boys; and deed it's the dark corner I got into then; and then Father John says to Pat Doyle, 'Are you come to confession?' says he. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle, 'I confessed my sins to God this

morning.' 'Much good that'll do you,' says Father John; 'what were you promised for turning?' says he. So Pat Doyle didn't say a word. 'Was it money?' says Father John; 'was it five pounds?' 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'Was it meal?' says Father John. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'Was it soup?' says Father John. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'And what was it you were promised?' says Father John; 'tell it out, man, before the people,' says he. 'Salvation, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. Well, Father John looked done for a minute, anyway; and then, says he, 'Are you coming back to Mass?' says he. 'No, your reverence,' says Pat Doyle. 'And what will you and your children live on if you don't, when you were promised nothing?' says Father John. 'Please your reverence,' says Pat Doyle, 'we'll live on the blossoms of the bushes afore we go back.' Well, if I wasn't thinking what would come on Pat Doyle, or myself too, if I was caught, when who should come in but the Rev. Mr. Owens himself; for he was coming up the street, and he seen Pat Doyle fetched in to the station, and just followed him in, and he just comes right up to Father John, and says to him, 'Sir, it was I that took this man, Pat Doyle, away from your Mass, for I showed him that the sacrifice of Christ was finished on the cross, never more to be repeated; and that no Christian man should bow down in worship to a wafer. And I am ready now, sir, to show you, before the people, why no Christian man should do so, if you will undertake to show them why they should.' 'Pat Devine, where's Pat Devine?' says Father John. 'Here, sir,' says Pat. 'Is it getting my horse you are? Will he never be ready?' says Father John. 'Yes, sir, coming, sir,' says Pat Devine, and out he comes with the horse in a hurry. 'Oh, your reverence,' says Peggy Donoghue; 'sure you won't go without hearing my confession.' 'Oh! your reverence,' says Sal Gougerty, and all of them, 'won't you stop a bit for us?' 'Out of the way, women,' says Father John; 'is it all day I'll be kept here?' And up he gets on his horse, with Pat Devine holding the bridle and the stirrup, and flattering him all he could, and I peeping out of the open window: and I seen, as he rode off, that Pat Devine just turned the wrong side of his hand after him; and says he, 'The back of my hand to you, that wouldn't stand up for your Church and your religion.'"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "sure Paddy Doyle puts us all to shame, that wasn't afeard to stand up like a man."

"Well, maybe so," said Pat; "but sure why can't a man keep it all to himself, when it sets the country against him? Sure I trust in nothing but Christ and His blood, that cleanseth from all sin: but why would I go to say that out, and bring trouble on myself?"

Who knows but the time is coming, when Pat himself will say it before men? Pat does not know it, nor mean it now. But the time comes to every one that truly trusts in Christ, when something in their breasts within will make them confess Christ before men; for otherwise Christ would have to deny them before His Father in heaven.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We request our correspondent B. H. to give us his address, as, before inserting his communication, we wish for some further information respecting it.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

If any of our friends could favour us with a copy or copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Nos. 2, 8, or 11, to complete sets, we should be greatly obliged.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER, 1853.

THERE are but two ways of ruling the world. The one, that of reducing men to passive obedience, by practising on their fears of evil, and making them slaves; the other, by winning the affections and satisfying the convictions of rational free agents, and thus securing their voluntary obedience to well-ordered rule. These systems may be briefly called slavery and freedom. The

one seeks to keep men narrow-minded, grovelling, ignorant, and superstitious; the other, to make them intellectual, spiritual, wise, and happy.

To which system does true Christianity belong? If to the former, she would do wisely, no doubt, to shut up the portals of knowledge, and to limit the field of vision, lest men, having once enjoyed a glimpse of the glorious canopy of heaven, should struggle to emancipate themselves from that tyranny which would doom them to grope in darkness and ignorance for ever, rather than peril its own selfish sway over their minds and liberties.

If, however, Christianity be a system whose power consists in its suitableness to enlighten, to elevate, to purify our race, and exacts nothing more than the voluntary obedience of reasoning free agents, the defensive armour of a shrinking or timid policy does not suit her. Let the priests of another faith ply their prudential expedients to keep the world from enlarging its knowledge, lest to the same extent they should diminish their own power. True Christianity stands in a higher and firmer attitude. She has, thanks be to God, come down to us with all the majesty of truth, and with all the grandeur of age, unscathed by the pigmy philosophy which would, by undermining man's faith in an unseen world, reduce him to the level of the beasts that perish. The solemn march of eighteen centuries has but demonstrated more clearly that religious truth is seated on a rocky pinnacle, whose summit may, indeed, have sometimes been obscured by the clouds of error or doubt, but which has survived, and will still survive the storms of time, and remain unaltered through eternity. With such a religion as this there is nothing to hide. A half-learned and superficial public may associate with the very notion of a priesthood, the blindness and bigotry of a sinking cause, but they must be taught that Christianity is not a bigotted or a sinking cause, and that those who are able to estimate its grand simplicity, are fearless of the most thorough sifting of its pretensions, and neither require mankind slavishly to take it for granted, nor are disposed to shun a single question that can be started on the subject of Christian evidences. Again, we say, with such a religion as this there is nothing to hide. All should be above board. The broadest light of day should be made fully and freely to circulate throughout all her mysteries. Secrets she has none. Her office has been to reveal mysteries—to bring life and immortality to light—to make known what was before kept secret from the foundation of the world. With the frankness and simplicity of conscious greatness, she invites free inquiry, and challenges scrutiny; and whether she has to contend with the pride of philosophy, falsely so called, or to oppose herself to the prejudices of the unenlightened multitude, she is not afraid to do so on her own strength, and spurns the props and auxiliaries of superstition, of which the votaries of a weaker or doubtful faith are so anxious to take advantage. Essentially a religion of light, she is ever ready to come to the light, that her deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.

We have been led into these considerations by reflecting on what appears to us to have been the cause and the probable consequences of the late modification of the system of National Education in this country, to which we have made allusion in another part of our paper—we mean the exclusion of the work on the *Evidences of Christianity*, which (after a twenty years' approbation) has at length been effected by the influence of those who would rather trust to the system of implicit faith in authority, aided by the props and aids of superstition, than attempt, by teaching mankind to think and reason rightly, to place their faith on the more solid basis of reason and knowledge. We have, perhaps, been

* See St. Matthew's Gospel, x. 33; and St. Mark, viii. 38.

also influenced by the reflection, that our own exertions to promote the cause of enlightened religion and Christian unity, have been everywhere met by the priests of Rome with a determination, as far as in them lies, to stifle thought and put down inquiry, and in some cases, at least, by misrepresentations and calumnies so gross, that none but the most ignorant can be deluded by them.

Most assuredly the time is not far off, when men who live in a free country, and know that they are no longer ignorant and superstitious, but able to use their reason, will assume courage, and venture to inquire fearlessly (we hope it may not be rashly or in an improper spirit), not merely into conflicting forms of Christian belief, but even into the truth of the pretensions of Christianity itself. We are strongly persuaded that an antidote to infidelity must be found in enlarged reason and increased knowledge, and not in the inculcation of blind faith. It is not by keeping men from investigating the evidences of religion, that they can be preserved from the dangers of scepticism and doubt; it is not by limiting education, but by extending it. The priests of a foreign system may, indeed, find it their interest to postpone the evil day of thought, and scrutiny, and free examination, by every means in their power. We warn them, however, that they may strain the cords too far, by which they would hope to restrain the multitude from pressing too curiously into their mysterious precincts. The man who has once got a glimpse of freedom, and discovered that his neighbours have acquired the same, will not be slow in allying himself with kindred spirits for their mutual benefit; men will thus strengthen one another in their common struggle for light and knowledge; and the more eagerly the priesthood of any religious system struggles for *dominion* over their minds and consciences, the more earnestly will laymen fortify themselves for the great struggle to be free. If the priests of Rome would maintain their supremacy, we tell them they must do so by a fair and manly attempt to prove their opponents wrong and themselves right; not by proclaiming all inquiry to be sinful, and denouncing those who would hear both sides, as infidels or apostates. If they would have the world to be what *they call* Catholic, they must allow their own claims to be discussed in a candid and Christian temper. They must cease from a warfare of curses, and denunciations, and instigation of popular violence, against those who (whether they be right or wrong in their opinions) are sincerely anxious to discover and propagate truth. They must, if they can, meet argument by argument, not by violence and abuse. If the press is made an instrument of disseminating error, why do they not use it to disseminate truth? If such pages as our own can be counteracted by a publication more learned, more accurate, more deeply thinking than ours, why do they not establish such a publication? We can assure them it would be read by both parties, and, if they have truth on their side, would produce them a golden harvest, both of money and fame. There is one reason—we think there can be but one—why they have not ventured, and we are bold enough to foretell why they never will venture on such a step, and it is simply this—that their wisest men know that their main strength consists in the ignorance and timid credulity of the multitude, and that the atmosphere of free discussion is not favourable to the growth of what they call piety, and we call superstition. We are sure there are many sincere and excellent, though, perhaps, shortsighted men in the Church of Rome, who would readily try, if permitted by their longer-headed superiors, to measure lances with us, as we rejoice to see some of our able and intelligent brother laymen have done, honourably and spiritedly, though, in a more limited

way than we would desire in our pages; but such leaders as Cardinal Wiseman, and Dr. Cullen, and Mr. Newman are, we opine, too wise to hazard such a commission of inquiry into the truth of a Christianity, moulded after the fashion of the middle ages, and would rather leave the Bible without any other basis than the voluntary credulity of those who may be willing to accept both its authenticity and its alleged doctrines, on the assumed authority of their exclusive Church, than run the risk of teaching men to think for themselves. To men of that stamp, no doubt, any work on the evidences of Christianity, however able and unexceptionable in other respects, is objectionable in this, that it leads its readers into those regions of reason and inquiry, where proofs are looked for and *must* be provided, and out of the domains of that implicit faith in which all things are to be *taken for granted, and nothing proved*; forgetting the injunction of the Apostle—“*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*”—1 Thessalonians v. 21 (Douay Bible). Will any of the Bishops or Priests of the Church of Rome now come forward, in or out of our pages, to grapple with and discuss the question of the boasted infallibility of their Church? or will they trust to the old policy still, and calculate on mankind for ever continuing to *take it for granted*, without proof? We shall see.

Correspondence.

ON THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The visibility of the Church being a subject in which every class of Christians should feel a deep interest, and which I am anxious thoroughly to investigate, without any admixture of bad feeling, and as you have repeatedly signified your willingness to have it discussed in your journal, I beg to trespass on your usual kindness in resuming the matter, and to state, most distinctly, that any apparently strong expressions I may have used were not by any means designed to irritate or to give offence, but merely to elicit from you the most powerful reply that the advocates of your system are capable of putting forward, and which, from your talents and resources, you would appear so pre-eminently qualified to give.

The “arguments to prove that Christ might have no visible Church on earth” are the best that I have invariably heard used by Protestants, lay and clerical, with whom I have been acquainted; so, for their edification as well my own, I am amply compensated for my trouble in finding such arguments rejected by you, and thrown overboard altogether.

Now, sir, as you are an avowed advocate of the perpetuity and visibility of your Church, I maintain I have a perfect right to challenge any epoch in your Church history, as naturally involving a question of the visibility. I could with equal advantage select other periods—that of Berengarius, upon which I happened to light, will answer the purpose.

You indignantly repudiate the idea of the Roman Church, and the others in communion with her, being at that time the Church of Christ; you say I have misunderstood your words on this head. If I have, you are to blame. In my first letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, 1853, page 9), I have put the same construction upon these words, and you then quietly acquiesced in this interpretation. You say I have mistaken the meaning of the 19th Article, which, in your sense, is “the sublimest definition of the visible Church.” Is it, I ask, a definition of an nonentity, or of something that has a real being? If it be a reality, why not point out the locus of its existence, as I said before? or is it a definition of something that exists only in your own imagination? “Oh,” you say, “it was all over the world, wherever there were bishops, clergy, and people,” &c. (C. L., July, 1853, p. 81). Surely, sensible men of your own communion will not be satisfied with so vague and indefinite an answer, much less persons of a different religious persuasion. Then you say—“It is time to look at the great fact, that the Greek and Eastern Churches really exist, though not in communion with Rome, superior to her in having preserved the Catholic creeds without mixture or addition” (C. L., July, 1853, p. 82).

Sir, I am aware of the existence of these Churches. Am I to understand that they constituted the true Church of Christ? If I take your words in this sense, I dread a castigation for making “a part equal to the whole;” and if they are not so taken, it is to no purpose to mention the existence of these Churches—“Quo teneam vultus mutantem protea nodo.”

Now, sir, as this is a new feature in our controversy, I shall propose to you this dilemma:—If these Churches

were not the true Church of Christ, you have failed to point out any true visible Church of Christ at all; and if these were the true Church, I call upon you to reconcile this with the 19th Article itself, which says that *these* Eastern Churches had erred as well as Rome “in their discipline, ceremonies, and faith.” Mind that.

But you will exclaim, “Our correspondent mistakes the meaning of the Article,” which only says that the Eastern Churches had erred *too*, but not so grievously as Rome, and the Greek Church is not at all censured by the Article: so, according to our principles, “they would not cease to be a visible Church.”

That the Greeks believe Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass is a fact so well authenticated, that candid Protestants do not attempt to dispute its certainty. That learned traveller, William Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, in a treatise, entitled “Moderate and Pacific Reflections on Controversy,” acknowledges that the “Greeks and Latins agree in this belief.” He quotes the testimony of Greek writers. Nicetas, in his “Orthodox Treasure;” Euthymius, in his “Panoply;” Nicholas, Bishop of Methone; Samonas, Bishop of Gaza; Nicholas Cabasilas; Mark of Ephesus; and Bessarion—all these openly profess this dogma in their works. Add to these the celebrated historian and physician, Gaspar Pucerus, and the English traveller, Sandius, in his “Mirror of Europe,” page 233, says—“The Greeks agree with the Romans on Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice and principal parts of the Mass.”

Professor Brerewood, of London, in his “History of all the Religions throughout the World,” does not venture to assert that on Transubstantiation the Greeks differ in any respect from the Latin Church. Speaking of the Assyrians, the Copts or Egyptians, the Abyssinians, he does not assert that they differ in this point from the Roman Church.

The Lutheran Olearius, in his “Travels from Muscovy,” says:—“The Muscovites believe Transubstantiation; that is, that the bread and wine are truly changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ.”

Cerularius, Bishop of Constantinople, who wrote with great virulence against the Latin Church, soon after the condemnation of Berengarius, and, amongst other matters, for using unleavened bread in the sacrament, does not charge her with any error on the Eucharist.

At the Council of Florence, when the Greek and Latin Churches were reconciled and united, they had no disagreement about Transubstantiation, though all other grounds of dissension were examined. The Eastern Churches also, and particularly the Greek Church, deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son.—See Acts of the Council of Trosly, held A.D. 909, by Herve, Archbishop of Rheims, and his suffragans. This dogma is inserted into the Nicene Creed, and professed in the Fifth Article of the Church of England.

If you persist, after this, to maintain that these Churches had preserved the Catholic creeds inviolate, and that they were the true, visible Church of Christ, yours must be latitudinarian principles, indeed.

In fine, I call upon you, unequivocally, to say why Berengarius did not put himself under the patronage of these Churches. If they were the true Church, and he persecuted for truth, they would at once extend to him sympathy and protection. The distance to either place (as you will see by the map) was comparatively short, and he could thus have avoided the disagreeable alternative of being either a “weathercock or a martyr.”

Sir, I hope you will give this matter of the Eastern Churches “a candid consideration.” I do not see how you can reconcile my objections, without coming to the conclusion that these Churches, equally with Rome, had repudiated the new-fangled opinions of Berengarius; and that this man, at that time the only representative of Protestant principles, had not one place in this wide world, to look to for sympathy or protection, “destruction before him and sorrow behind.”

Φιλαλήτης.

The question between us and “Philaethes,” as to the sense in which we have spoken of the Church, appears to us to be this:—We had spoken of the “Christian Church,” and “the Church of Christ;” and in his last letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, July, 1853, p. 81), “Philaethes” put this construction on what we said—“You mean, of course, the Roman Church, and the other Churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ.”

Of this we said—“We spoke plainly and evidently of the whole Church, and our correspondent says—‘Of course, you mean a part only.’” (July, p. 2, col. 1). Our correspondent now replies again to this; and his reply seems to be to this effect—“I beg your pardon for having mistaken you; I thought, when you spoke of ‘the Christian Church,’ you meant a part of it *only*—that is, the Roman part; but now I see plainly that you meant the other part *only*—that is, the Greek part.” We really must tell our correspondent that he has mistaken us again. When we speak of the Christian Church, or the Church of Christ, we do *not* mean either part, or *any* part by itself, but we mean the whole. We have already explained our meaning in a way which we thought prevented the possibility of mistake. We mean “by the visible Church of Christ on earth,” the sum total of all bishops, priests, and people, professing the Christian faith, over the whole